

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

AUDRA MCCOWAN, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

CITY OF PHILADELPHIA, et al.,

Defendants.

CIVIL ACTION

NO. 19-3326-KSM

ORDER

AND NOW, this 15th day of January, 2021, upon consideration of Defendants' Motion for Clarification or Reconsideration of the Court's Order Denying Defendants' Motion to Quash a Third Party Subpoena (Doc. No. 118), A. Nicole Phillips, Esq.'s Attorney Affidavit (Doc. No. 118-1), and Plaintiffs' Response in Opposition to Defendants' Motion for Reconsideration (Doc. No. 119), it is **ORDERED** that the motion is **GRANTED in PART** and **DENIED in PART** as follows:

1. To the extent the motion seeks reconsideration of the Court's November 4, 2020 Order (Doc. No. 112), it is **DENIED**.

2. To the extent the motion seeks clarification on the Court's November 4, 2020 Order (Doc. No. 112), it is **GRANTED**. Specifically, we clarify that nothing in our previous Order prohibits Ms. Phillips or Montgomery McCracken from raising the attorney-client privilege as to specific documents responsive to Plaintiffs' subpoena (Doc. No. 94-1). Ms.

Phillips and Montgomery McCracken shall produce all documents and/or privilege logs responsive to Plaintiffs' subpoena within thirty days of the date of this Order.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

/s/Karen Spencer Marston

KAREN SPENCER MARSTON, J.